arXiv:1611.00981v1 [math.CO] 3 Nov 2016

Turán numbers for disjoint paths *

Long-Tu Yuan and Xiao-Dong Zhang†

School of Mathematical Sciences, MOE-LSC, SHL-MAC

Shanghai Jiao Tong University

800 Dongchuan Road, Shanghai, 200240, P.R. China

Email: yuanlongtu@sjtu.edu.cn, xiaodong@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

The Turán number of a graph H, $ex(n, H)$, is the maximum number of edges in any graph of order n which does not contain H as a subgraph. Lidický, Liu and Palmer determined $ex(n, F_m)$ for n sufficiently large and proved that the extremal graph is unique, where F_m is disjoint paths of $P_{k_1}, \ldots, P_{k_m}$ [Lidický, B., Liu, H. and Palmer, C. (2013). On the Turán number of forests. *Electron. J. Combin.* **20(2)** Paper 62, 13 pp]. In this paper, by mean of a different approach, we determine $ex(n, F_m)$ for all integers n with minor conditions, which extends their partial results. Furthermore, we partly confirm the conjecture proposed by Bushaw and Kettle for $ex(n, k \cdot P_l)$ [Bushaw, N. and Kettle, N. (2011) Turán numbers of multiple paths and equibipartite forests. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **20** 837-853]. Moreover, we show that there exist two family graphs F_m and F'_m such that $ex(n, F_m) = ex(n, F'_m)$ for all integers n, which is related to an old problem of Erdős and Simonovits.

Key words: Turán number; disjoint paths; extremal graph.

AMS Classifications: 05C35, 05C05.

1 Introduction

The graphs considered in this paper are finite, undirected, and simple (no loops or multiple edges). Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a simple graph, where $V(G)$ is the vertex set and $E(G)$ is the edge set with size $e(G)$. Let G and H be two disjoint graphs. Denote by $G \bigcup H$ the disjoint union of G and H and by $k \cdot G$ the disjoint union of k copies of a graph G. Denote by $G + H$ the graph obtained from $G \bigcup H$ by joining each vertex of G to each vertex of H. If $S \subseteq V(G)$, the subgraph of G induced by S is denoted by $G[S]$. Moreover, Denote by P_k a path on k vertices, K_n the completed graph with n vertices, $\overline{G}$ the complement graph of G.

*This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos.11531001 and 11271256), the Joint NSFC-ISF Research Program (jointly funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China and the Israel Science Foundation (No. 11561141001)), Innovation Program of Shanghai Municipal Education Commission (No. 14ZZ016) and Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education (No.20130073110075).

†Correspondent author: Xiao-Dong Zhang (Email: xiaodong@sjtu.edu.cn)

The *Turán number* of a graph H, $ex(n,H)$, is the maximum number of edges in a graph G of order n which does not contain H as a subgraph. Denote by $Ex(n,H)$ a graph on n vertices with $ex(n,H)$ edges which does not contain H as a subgraph and call this graph an *extremal graph* for H. Moreover, Denote by $ex_{con}(n,H)$ the maximum number of edges in a connected graph G of order n which does not contain H as a subgraph, and denote by $Ex_{con}(n,H)$ a connected graph on n vertices with $ex_{con}(n,H)$ edges which does not contain H as a subgraph. Often there are several extremal graphs. In 1941, Turán [22] proved that the extremal graph which does not contain K_r as a subgraph is the complete $(r-1)$-partite graph on n vertices which is balanced, in that the part sizes are as equal as possible (any two sizes differ by at most 1). This balanced complete $(r-1)$-partite graph on n vertices is the Turán graph $T_{r-1}(n)$. On the other hand, for sparse graphs, Erdős and Gallai [5] in 1959 proved the following well known result.

Theorem 1.1 *[5] Let G be a graph with n vertices. If G does not contain a path with k vertices and $n \geq k \geq 2$, then $e(G) \leq \frac{1}{2}(k-2)n$ with equality if and only if $n = (k-1)t$ and $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{t} K_{k-1}$.*

It follows from the above theorem that $ex(n,P_k) = \frac{1}{2}(k-2)n$ for $n = (k-1)t$, and $ex(n,P_k)$ is not determined for $k-1$ not being a factor of n. Later Faudree and Schelp [9] extended the above result for all integers n and k.

For convenience, we first introduce the following symbols.

Definition 1.2 *Let $n \geq m \geq l \geq 3$ be given three positive integers. Then n can be written as $n = (m-1) + t(l-1) + r$, where $t \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r < l-1$. Denote by*

$$[n,m,l] \equiv \binom{m-1}{2} + t\binom{l-1}{2} + \binom{r}{2}$$

and

$$[n,m] \equiv \binom{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1}{2} + \lfloor \frac{m-2}{2} \rfloor \left(n - \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor + 1\right).$$

Moreover, if $n \leq m-1$, denote by

$$[n,m,l] \equiv \binom{n}{2}.$$

Let $n \geq m \geq l \geq 3$. If $G_1 = K_{m-1} \bigcup t \cdot K_{l-1} \bigcup K_r$ and $G_2 = \overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor + 1} + K_{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1}$, then

$$e(G_1) = [n,m,l], \quad e(G_2) = [n,m].$$

Theorem 1.3 *[9] Let G be a graph with $n \geq k$ vertices, if G does not contain a path with k vertices, then $e(G) \leq [n,k,k]$ with equality if and only if G is either $G = (\bigcup_{i=1}^{t} K_{k-1}) \bigcup K_r$ or $G = (\bigcup_{i=1}^{t-s-1} K_{k-1}) \bigcup (K_{\frac{k-2}{2}} + \overline{K}_{\frac{k}{2}+s(k-1)+r})$ for some s, $0 \leq s < t$, when k is even, $t > 0$, and $r = \frac{k}{2}$ or $\frac{k-2}{2}$, where $n = (k-1)t + r$ and $0 \leq r < k-1$.*

In other words, $ex(n,P_k)$ has been determined for all integers $n > k$ and all extremal graphs has also been characterized. For connected graphs, Kopylov [17], in 1977, determined $ex_{con}(n,P_k)$. In 2008, Balister, Győri, Lehel and Schelp [1] used a different approach and determined $ex_{con}(n,P_k)$ and characterized all extremal graphs.

Theorem 1.4 *[1, 17] Let G be a connected graph on $n \geq k \geq 4$ vertices which does not contain a path with k vertices. Then*

$$e(G) \leq \max\left\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2), [n,k] + i - 1\right\}.$$

$(i = 2$ *when* k *is odd,* $i = 1$ *when* k *is even)*

Further, the equality occurs if and only if G is either

$$(K_{k-3} \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-k+2}) + K_1$$

or

$$(K_i \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor}) + K_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1}.$$

Remark. A simple calculation shows that for $k > 5$, if k is even, the extremal graphs are

$$\begin{array}{ll} (K_{k-3} \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-k+2}) + K_1 & \text{for } \ n \leq \frac{5k-10}{4}; \\ (K_1 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor}) + K_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1} & \text{for } \ n \geq \frac{5k-10}{4}. \end{array}$$

If k is odd, the extremal graphs are

$$\begin{array}{ll} (K_{k-3} \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-k+2}) + K_1 & \text{for } \ n \leq \frac{5k-7}{4}; \\ (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor}) + K_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1} & \text{for } \ n \geq \frac{5k-7}{4}. \end{array}$$

In 1962, Erdős [6] first studied on the Turán number of $k \cdot K_3$. Later, Moon [19] (only when $r-1$ divides $n-k+1$) and Simonovits [21] showed that $K_{k-1} + T_{r-1}(n-k+1)$ is the unique extremal graph which does not contain $k \cdot K_r$ for n sufficiently large. In 2011, Bushaw and Kettle [3] determined $ex(n, k \cdot P_l)$ for n sufficiently large.

Theorem 1.5 *[3] If $k \geq 2, l \geq 4$ and $n \geq 2l + 2kl(\lceil \frac{l}{2} \rceil + 1)\binom{l}{\lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor}$, then*

$$ex(n, k \cdot P_l) = \left[n, k\lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor\right] + c_l,$$

where $c_l = 1$ if l is odd, and $c_l = 0$ if l is even.

Further, their proof shows that their construction is optimal for $n = \Omega(kl^{\frac{3}{2}}2^l)$. Hence Bushaw and Kettle conjectured that their construction is optimal for $n = \Omega(kl)$. In other words, they conjectured that the above theorem holds for $n = \Omega(kl)$. Recently, Lidický, Liu and Palmer [18] extended Bushaw and Kettle's result and determined $ex(n, F_m)$ for n sufficiently large, where $F_m = P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{k_m}$ and $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_m$.

Theorem 1.6 *[18] Let $F_m = P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{k_m}$ and $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_m$. If at least one k_i is not 3, then for n sufficiently large,*

$$ex(n, F_m) = \left[n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lfloor \frac{k_i}{2} \rfloor\right] + c,$$

where $c = 1$ if all k_i are odd and $c = 0$ otherwise. Moreover, the extremal graph is unique.

However, They do not consider the Turán number $ex(n, F_m)$ for small n. If $k_1 = k_2 = \ldots = k_m = 3$, Gorgol [13] determined $ex(n, 2 \cdot P_3)$ and $ex(n, 3 \cdot P_3)$. Further Bushaw and Kettle [3] determined $ex(n, k \cdot P_3)$ for $n \geq 7k$, and the extremal graphs are unique $K_{k-1} + M_{n-k+1}$. Later, Yuan and Zhang [23] determined the value $ex(n, k \cdot P_3)$ for all n and all extremal graphs which are $K_{3k-1} \bigcup M_{n-3k+1}$ and $K_{k-1} + M_{n-k+1}$.

Further Erdős and Simonovits [8] (see also [2], chapter 6, problem 41.) asked that if F_1 and F_2 are two bipartite graphs, Giving conditions on F_1 and F_2 ensuring that $ex(n, F_1) = ex(n, F_2)$. In addition, it is nature to ask what is the Turán number of disjoint union of paths, cycles in hypergraphs (see [4, 14]). Another similar problem is the Erdős's matching conjecture [7] which is a very difficult problem of Turán problems for expansions [20], especially when n is small. The readers may be referred to [10, 11, 15]. For more information about Turán number problems, recently, there are two excellent surveys [12, 16].

Motivated by the results of [3, 18] and other related results, we study the Turán number $ex(n, F_m)$ for all integers n, especial for n small. Our main results in this paper can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.7 *Let $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_m \geq 3$ and $n \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i$. If there is at most one odd in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$, then*

$$ex(n, F_m) = \max\left\{[n, k_1, k_1], [n, k_1 + k_2, k_2], \ldots, [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i]\right\}.$$

Moreover, if $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m$ are even, then the extremal graphs are characterized.

If there are two odds in $\{k_1, \ldots, k_m\}$, we have the following partial results.

Theorem 1.8 *Let $n \geq 2l + 4$. Then*

$$ex(n, P_{2l+1} \bigcup P_3) = \max\{[n, 2l + 1, 2l + 1], [n, 2l + 4, 3], [n, l] + 1\}.$$

Moreover, the extremal graphs are

$$Ex(n, P_{2l+1}), K_{2l+3} \bigcup M_{n-2l-3} \text{ and } K_l + \left(K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-l-2}\right),$$

where M_{n-2l-3} is a maximum matching with $n - 2l - 3$ vertices.

Theorem 1.9 *Let $n \geq 10$. Then*

$$ex(n, P_5 \bigcup P_5) = \max\{[n, 10, 5], 3n - 5\}.$$

Moreover, the extremal graphs are $K_9 \bigcup Ex(n, P_5)$ and $K_3 + (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-5})$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, several technical Observations and Lemmas are obtained. In Section 3, the proofs of Theorem 1.7 and corollaries are presented. Further, we partly confirm Bushaw and Kettle's conjecture and present two family graphs F_m and F'_m such that $ex(n, F_m) = ex(n, F'_m)$ for all n. In Sections 4 and 5, the proofs of Theorems 1.8 and 1.9 are presented, respectively. In Section 6, a conjecture is proposed for the conclusion.

2 Several Observations and Lemmas

2.1 Several Observations

In order to prove Lemmas and main results, we need the following Observations. Let $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq k_m \geq 3$ be three positive integers with at most one odd. The following observations can be proved with the help of the extremal graphs of Theorems 1.3, Theorem 1.4 and some calculations, which are given in Appendix A.

Observation 1: Let $n \geq k_1 + k_m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\left\{\binom{k_1+k_m-2}{2} + n - k_1 - k_m + 2, [n, k_1+k_m]\right\} \\ \leq \quad & \max\left\{[n, k_1+k_m, k_m], [n, k_1+k_m]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observation 2: Let $n_1 \geq k_1$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_m, k_m] \leq [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_m, k_m].$$

Moreover, if $n_1 = k_1 + t_1(k_m-1) + r_1, n_2 = t_2(k_m-1) + r_2$, where $0 \leq r_1 < k_m - 1$ and $0 \leq r_2 < k_m - 1$, then Observation 2 becomes equality only when $r_1 = 0$ or $r_2 = 0$.

Observation 3: Let $n_1 \geq k_1$ and $n_2 \geq k_2$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2+k_m, k_m] < [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_2+k_m, k_m].$$

Observation 4: Let $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_m$ and $n_2 \geq k_2 + k_m$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m] + [n_2, k_2+k_m] < [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_2+k_m].$$

Observation 5: Let $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_m$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m] + [n_2, k_m, k_m] < [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_m].$$

Observation 6: Let $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_m$ and $n_2 \geq k_2$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m] + [n_2, k_2+k_m, k_m] < [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_2+k_m].$$

Observation 7: Let $n_1 \geq k_1, n_2 \geq k_2 + k_m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & [n_1, k_1+k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2+k_m] \\ < \quad & \max\left\{[n_1+n_2, k_1+k_2+k_m, k_m], [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_2+k_m]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

2.2 Several Lemmas

Lemma 2.1 *Let G be a connected graph with n vertices and $F_m = P_{k_1} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{k_m}$, where $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_m \geq 3$, $k = \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i$, and $m \geq 2$.*

(1) If there are all even in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$, then $ex_{con}(n, F_m) = ex_{con}(n, P_k)$. Moreover, the extremal graph is $Ex_{con}(n, P_k)$.

(2) If there is exact one odd in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$ with $k_m > 3$, then $ex_{con}(n, F_m) = \max\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2), [n, k]\}$.

(3) If there are all even in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_{m-1}\}$ with $k_m = 3$, then $ex_{con}(n, F_m) \leq ex_{con}(n, P_k) - 1 = \max\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2) - 1, [n, k]\}$.

Proof. (1) If there are all even in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$, by Theorem 1.4, it is easy to see that $Ex_{con}(n, P_k)$ contains no F_m, which implies that $ex(n, F_m) \geq ex_{con}(n, P_k)$. On the other hand, since a graph G of order n with $ex_{con}(n, P_k) + 1$ must contains P_k, so G must contain F_m. Hence the assertion holds. Moreover, it is obviously that the extremal graph is $Ex_{con}(n, P_k)$.

(2) If there is exact one odd in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$ with $k_m > 3$, let $G_1 = (\overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1}) + K_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1}$ and $G_2 = K_{k+3} \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-k+2} + K_1$. Since both of G_1 and G_2 contain no F_m with $e(G_1) = [n, k]$ and $e(G_2) = \binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2)$, $ex_{con}(n, F_m) \geq \max\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2), [n, k]\}$. On the other hand, let G be any graph with $e(G) \geq \max\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2), [n, k]\} + 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\geq \max\left\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2) + 1, [n, k] + 1\right\} \\ &\geq ex_{con}(n, P_k) \\ &= \max\left\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2), [n, k] + 1\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

since there is exactly one odd in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$. If $e(G) > ex(n, P_k)$, then G contains P_k, i.e., F_m, by Theorem 1.4. If $e(G) = ex(n, P_k)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &= \max\left\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2) + 1, [n, k] + 1\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{\binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2), [n, k] + 1\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $e(G) = [n, k]+1$ and $n > \frac{5k-7}{4}$. By Theorem 1.4, either G contains P_k, or $G = (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor}) + K_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1}$, which contains F_m. The assertion holds.

(3) If $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_{m-1}$ are all even and $k_m = 3$, let G be any graph with $e(G) \geq ex_{con}(n, P_k)$. If $e(G) > ex_{con}(n, P_k)$, then G contains P_k, i.e., F_m, by Theorem 1.4. If $e(G) = ex_{con}(n, P_k)$ and G contains P_k, then G contains F_m, if $e(G) = ex_{con}(n, P_k)$ and G does not contain P_k, then by Theorem 1.4, G is either $(K_{k-3} \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-k+2}) + K_1$ or $(K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor}) + K_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1}$, both contain F_m. So the assertion holds. ■

Remark. (1) Let k be an odd number. By a simple calculation, $[n, k] > \binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2)$ for $n > \frac{5k-7}{4} + \frac{2}{k-5}$; $[n, k] < \binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2)$ for $n < \frac{5k-7}{4} + \frac{2}{k-5}$; and $[n, k] = \binom{k-2}{2} + (n-k+2)$ for $n = \frac{5k-7}{4} + \frac{2}{k-5}$. (2) If there is exact one odd in $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m\}$, it is interesting to determine $ex_{con}(n, F_m)$ and $Ex_{con}(n, F_m)$.

Lemma 2.2 *Let G be a graph with n vertices. If $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq 3, n \geq k_1 + k_2$, k_1, k_2 are not both odd, then*

$$ex(n, P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}) = \max\{[n, k_1, k_1], [n, k_1 + k_2, k_2], [n, k_1 + k_2]\}.$$

Moreover, if k_1, k_2 are both even, then the extremal graphs are

$$Ex(n, P_{k_1}),\ K_{k_1+k_2-1} \bigcup Ex(n - k_1 - k_2 + 1, P_{k_2}),\ K_{\frac{k_1+k_2}{2}-1} + \overline{K}_{n-\frac{k_1+k_2}{2}+1}.$$

Proof. Let G be any graph which does not contain $P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}$. Suppose that $e(G) > max\{[n, k_1, k_1], [n, k_1 + k_2, k_2], [n, k_1 + k_2]\}$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. G is connected. Then by Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 1.4,

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq ex_{con}(n, P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}) \\ &\leq \max\{\binom{k_1+k_2-2}{2} + (n-k_1-k_2+2), [n, k_1+k_2]\} \\ &\leq \max\{[n, k_1+k_2, k_2], [n, k_1+k_2]\}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality follows from Observation 1. This is a contradiction.

Case 2. G is disconnected. Since $e(G) > [n, k_1, k_1]$, G must contain P_{k_1} by theorem 1.3. Let C be the component with $n_1 \geq k_1$ vertices which contains P_{k_1}. Thus C does not contain $P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}$ and $G - C$ does not contain P_{k_2}. Let $n_2 = n - n_1$. If $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_2$, then by Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq ex_{con}(n_1, P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}) + ex(n_2, P_{k_2}) \\ &\leq \max\left\{\binom{k_1+k_2-2}{2} + n_1 - k_1 - k_2 + 2, [n_1, k_1+k_2]\right\} + [n_2, k_2, k_2] \\ &< \max\{[n, k_1+k_2, k_2], [n, k_1+k_2]\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact: (1) If $\binom{k_1+k_2-2}{2} + n_1 - k_1 - k_2 + 2 \geq [n_1, k_1+k_2]$, then $n_1 \leq \frac{5(k_1+k_2)-7}{4} + \frac{2}{k_1+k_2-5}$ for k_1+k_2 being odd, and $n_1 \leq \frac{5(k_1+k_2)-10}{4}$ for k_1+k_2 being even, which implies $\binom{k_1+k_2-2}{2} + n_1 - k_1 - k_2 + 2 + [n_2, k_2, k_2] < \binom{k_1+k_2-1}{2} + [n_2, k_2, k_2] \leq [n, k_1+k_2, k_2]$. (2) If $\binom{k_1+k_2-2}{2} + n_1 - k_1 - k_2 + 2 \leq [n_1, k_1+k_2]$ then $[n_1, k_1+k_2] + [n_2, k_2, k_2] < [n, k_1+k_2]$ follows from observation 5. This is also a contradiction. If $k_1 \leq n_1 < k_1 + k_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq ex_{con}(n_1, P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}) + ex(n_2, P_{k_2}) \\ &\leq \binom{n_1}{2} + [n_2, k_2, k_2] \\ &\leq \max\{[n, k_1+k_2, k_2], [n, k_1+k_2]\}, \end{aligned}$$

with the equality holds when $G = K_{k_1+k_2-1} \bigcup Ex(n-k_1-k_2+1, P_{k_2})$. This is a contradiction. Hence the assertion holds. Moreover, it's obviously that if k_1, k_2 are both even, then the extremal graphs are determined and we finish our proof. ■

Remark. If $k_1 \leq 5k_2$, it is easy to see that

$$ex(n, P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2}) = \max\{[n, k_1+k_2, k_2], [n, k_1+k_2]\} \text{ for } k_1 \leq 5k_2.$$

Lemma 2.3 *Let $n \geq \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, n_i \geq l_{i,1} + l_{i,2} + \ldots + l_{i,t_i}$, $l_{i,1} \geq l_{i,2} \geq \ldots \geq l_{i,t_i} \geq k_m, i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, s\}$. If there is at most one odd in $\{l_{1,1}, \ldots, l_{1,t_1}, \ldots, \ldots, l_{s,1}, \ldots, l_{s,t_s}, k_m\}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^{s} ex_{con}(n_i, P_{l_{i,1}} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{l_{i,t_i}} \bigcup P_{k_m}) + ex(n - \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, P_{k_m}) \\ &\qquad \leq \max\left\{[n, \sum_{i=1}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1 and Observation 1,

$$\begin{aligned} & ex_{con}(n_i, P_{l_{i,1}} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{l_{i,t_i}} \bigcup P_{k_m}) \\ \leq & \max\left\{[n_i, \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m, k_m], [n_i, \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Observations 3, 4, 6 and 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\left\{[n_1, \sum_{j=1}^{t_1} l_{1,j} + k_m, k_m], [n_1, \sum_{j=1}^{t_1} l_{1,j} + k_m]\right\} \\ & + \max\left\{[n_2, \sum_{j=1}^{t_2} l_{2,j} + k_m, k_m], [n_2, \sum_{j=1}^{t_2} l_{2,j} + k_m]\right\} \\ < & \max\left\{[n_1 + n_2, \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m, k_m], [n_1 + n_2, \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Theorem 1.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{s} ex_{con}(n_i, P_{l_{i,1}} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{l_{i,t_i}} \bigcup P_{k_m}) + ex(n - \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, P_{k_m}) \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^{s} \max\left\{[n_i, \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m, k_m], [n_i, \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m]\right\} + [n - \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, k_m, k_m] \\ \leq & \max\left\{[\sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, \sum_{i=1}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m, k_m], [\sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, \sum_{i=1}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m]\right\} \\ & + [n - \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, k_m, k_m] \\ \leq & \max\left\{[n, \sum_{i=1}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j} + k_m]\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Observations 2 and 5. Moreover, with equality holds if and only if $s = 1$ and the equality occurs in Observation 2. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.7 and Corollaries

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.7. **Proof.**[Proof of theorem 1.7]We prove Theorem 1.7 by induction on m. For $m = 2$, by Lemma 2.2, the assertion holds. Suppose it holds for smaller m. Let G be any graph which does not contain F_m and

$$e(G) > max\left\{[n, k_1, k_1], [n, k_1 + k_2, k_2], \ldots, [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i]\right\}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, G must contain F_{m-1}. If G is connected, by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq \max\left\{\binom{\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i - 2}{2} + n - \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i + 2, [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i]\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{[n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i]\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{[n, k_1, k_1], [n, k_1 + k_2, k_2], \ldots, [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i]\right\} \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Suppose G is disconnected. Since G contains F_{m-1}, let C_i be the component which contains $P_{l_{i,1}} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{l_{i,t_i}}$, where $\{l_{i,1}, \ldots, l_{i,t_i}\} \subseteq \{k_1, \ldots, k_{m-1}\}$, then C_i does not contain $P_{l_{i,1}} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{l_{i,t_i}} \bigcup P_{k_m}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. Further

$$G - C_1 \bigcup C_2 \bigcup \ldots \bigcup C_s \text{ does not contain } P_{k_m}.$$

Let $v(C_i) = n_i \geq \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} l_{i,j}$. By Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s} ex_{con}(n_i, P_{i_1} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{i_t} \bigcup P_{k_m}) + ex(n - \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i, P_{k_m}) \\ &\leq \max\left\{[n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i, k_m], [n, \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i]\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Let all of $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m$ be even. If G is disconnected and the equality occurs in lemma 2.3, then the equality must occur in observations 2. Moreover, if G is connected, by lemma 2.1, the extremal graphs are determined. Hence, by induction, it is easy to see that the extremal graphs are characterized, which are

$$Ex(n, P_{k_1}), \ldots, Ex(n - \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i + 1, P_{k_m}) \bigcup K_{\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i - 1},$$

$$K_{\sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{k_i}{2} - 1} + \overline{K}_{n - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{k_i}{2} + 1}.$$

In addition, $Ex(n, P_{k_1}), \ldots, Ex(n - \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i + 1, P_{k_m})$ are described in Theorem 1.3. ■

In particular,

Corollary 3.1 *[3] Let G be a graph with n vertices. If l is an even number, then*

$$ex(n, k \cdot P_l) = \max\{[n, kl, l], [n, kl]\}.$$

Moreover the extremal graphs are

$$Ex(n - kl + 1, P_l) \bigcup K_{kl-1}, K_{\frac{kl}{2} - 1} + \overline{K}_{n - \frac{kl}{2} + 1}.$$

Proof. Since $[n, kl, l] > [n, (k-1)l, l] > \ldots > [n, 2l, l] > [n, l, l]$, the assertion follows from Theorem 1.7. ■

Remark. In [3], Bushaw and Kettle showed that the graph

$$K_{k\lfloor \frac{l}{2}\rfloor -1} + (K_i + \overline{K}_{n-k\lfloor \frac{l}{2}\rfloor -i+1})$$

is the extremal graph of $ex(n, k\cdot P_l)$ for $k \geq 2, l \geq 4$, and $n \geq 2l+2kl(\lceil \frac{l}{2}\rceil +1)\binom{l}{\lfloor \frac{l}{2}\rfloor}$, ($i = 1$, when l is even, $i = 2$ when l is odd). Based on this result, they conjectured that this construction is optimal for $n = \Omega(kl)$. Let $n = (kl-1)+t(l-1)+r, 0 \leq r < l-1$. An simple calculation shows that if $n \geq \frac{5}{4}kl$, then $[n, kl] \geq [n, kl, l]$. In other words, we confirm their conjecture when l is even.

Corollary 3.2 *$ex(n, P_{6k}\bigcup P_{6k}\bigcup P_{4k}) = ex(n, P_{8k}\bigcup P_{4k}\bigcup P_{4k})$ for all n, k. Moreover, if $n \geq 14k$, the extremal graphs are $K_{16k-1}\bigcup Ex(n-16k+1, 4k)$ and $K_{8k-1}+\overline{K}_{n-8k+1}$.*

Proof. If $n < 14k$, Clearly the assertion holds. So we may assume $n \geq 14k$. By Theorem 1.7,

$$\begin{aligned} & ex(n, P_{6k}\bigcup P_{6k}\bigcup P_{4k}) \\ = & \max\{[n,16k,4k],[n,12k,6k],[n,6k,6k],[n,16k]\} \\ = & \max\{[n,16k,4k],[n,12k,6k],[n,16k]\} \\ = & \max\{[n,16k,4k],[n,16k]\}. \end{aligned}$$

The third quality follows form the following two cases: (1) If $n \geq 18k-2$, then $[n,16k] \geq [n,12k,6k]$. (2) If $n \leq 18k-2$, then $[n,16k,4k] \geq [n,12k,6k]$. Oh the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & ex(n, P_{8k}\bigcup P_{4k}\bigcup P_{4k}) \\ = & \max\{[n,16k,4k],[n,12k,4k],[n,8k,8k],[n,16k]\} \\ = & \max\{[n,16k,4k],[n,8k,8k],[n,16k]\} \\ = & \max\{[n,16k,4k],[n,16k]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the assertion holds. ■

Remark. In [8], Erdős and Simonovits asked that if F_1 and F_2 are two bipartite graphs, Giving conditions on F_1 and F_2 ensuring that $ex(n, F_1) = ex(n, F_2)$, provided n is sufficiently large (also see [2], chapter 6, problem 41). Let $F_m = P_{k_1}\bigcup\ldots\bigcup P_{k_m}, F'_{m'} = P_{k'_1}\bigcup\ldots\bigcup P_{k'_{m'}}$ and all of $\{k_1,\ldots,k_m\}$ are odd if and only if all of $\{k'_1,\ldots,k'_{m'}\}$ are odd. By Theorem 1.6 [18], if $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lfloor\frac{k_i}{2}\rfloor = \sum_{i=1}^{m'}\lfloor\frac{k'_i}{2}\rfloor$, then $ex(n, F'_{m'}) = ex(n, F_m)$, provided n is sufficiently large. Our results show that there exist two family graphs F_m and F'_m such that $ex(n, F_m) = ex(n, F'_m)$ for all n.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.8

In order to prove Theorem 1.8, we need the following notations and several Lemmas. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph. If u and v in V are adjacent, we say that u *hits* v or v *hits* u. If u and v are not adjacent, we say that u *misses* v or v *misses* u.

Lemma 4.1 *Let G be a graph with n vertices. If $n \geq 8$, then*

$$ex(n, P_5\bigcup P_3) = \max\left\{21+\lfloor\frac{n-7}{2}\rfloor, 2(n-1)\right\}.$$

Moreover, the extremal graphs are $K_7\bigcup M_{n-7}$ and $K_2+(K_2\bigcup\overline{K}_{n-4})$.

Proof. Let G be any graph which does not contain $P_5 \bigcup P_3$ with $e(G) \geq max\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n-7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n-1)\}$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. G is connected. Suppose that $G \neq K_2 + (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-4})$. By Theorem 1.4, G contains a P_7. Let $P_7 = x_1x_2 \ldots x_7$ be a subgraph in G. First we will show that there is no edge in $G - P_7$. Clearly, if there is an edge in $G - P_7$ then G contains $P_5 \bigcup P_3$, this is a contradiction. If all the vertices in $G - P_7$ hit exact one vertex in P_7, then they must hit x_3 or x_5, say y_1 hits x_3. Obviously, $\{x_1, x_2\}$ can't hit $\{x_4, x_5, x_7\}$ and if x_1 or x_2 hits x_6, then x_7 must miss x_5. Hence

$$e(G) \leq \binom{7}{2} - 6 - 1 + n - 7 = n + 7 < \max\left\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n-7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n-1)\right\}.$$

If at least one of the vertices in $G - P_7$ hits two vertices in P_7, then there is at most one edge x_2x_6 among $\{x_1, x_2\}, x_4, \{x_6, x_7\}$ and x_3 can't hit $\{x_6, x_7\}$, x_5 can't hit $\{x_1, x_2\}$. Hence

$$e(G) \leq 2(n-7) + \binom{7}{2} - \left(\binom{5}{2} - 3\right) - 4 = 2n - 4 < \max\left\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n-7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n-1)\right\}.$$

Both are contradictions.

Case 2. G is disconnected. By Theorem1.3, G contains P_5, Let C be the component with $n_1 \geq 5$ vertices which contains a P_5. Let $n_2 = n - n_1$. If $n_1 \geq 8$, then by the similar argument,

$$e(C) \leq \max\left\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n_1 - 7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n_1 - 1)\right\}, e(G - C) \leq \lfloor \frac{n_2}{2} \rfloor.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq e(C) + e(G - C) \\ &\leq \max\left\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n_1 - 7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n_1 - 1)\right\} + \lfloor \frac{n_2}{2} \rfloor \\ &< \max\left\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n-7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n-1)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality becomes equality if and only if $G - C = K_2 + (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n_1-4})$. If $n_1 \leq 7$, then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq e(G - C) + e(C) \\ &\leq \binom{n_1}{2} + \lfloor \frac{n_2}{2} \rfloor \\ &\leq \max\left\{21 + \lfloor \frac{n-7}{2} \rfloor, 2(n-1)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with equality when $G = K_7 \bigcup M_{n-7}$. So the assertion holds. ■

Lemma 4.2 *Let $G \neq K_{2l+3} \bigcup M_{n-2l-3}$ be a graph with n vertices and*

$$e(G) \geq \binom{2l+3}{2} + \lfloor \frac{n-2l-3}{2} \rfloor.$$

If G contains either C_{2l+2} or C_{2l+3}, then G contains $P_{2l+1} \bigcup P_3$.

Proof. Suppose G contains no $P_{2l+1}\bigcup P_3$. If G contains C_{2l+3}, then any vertex in $G-C_{2l+3}$ can't hit the vertices in C_{2l+3}. Hence $e(G)<\binom{2l+3}{2}+\lfloor\frac{n-2l-3}{2}\rfloor$, which is a contradiction. If G contains C_{2l+2}, then each component of $G-C_{2l+2}$ is either isolated vertex or edge. It is easy to see that the vertices of the edge in $G-C_{2l+2}$ can not hit C_{2l+2}, and any two of the isolated vertices in $G-C_{2l+2}$ can not hit the same vertex of C_{2l+2} or any two consecutive vertices of C_{2l+2}. Therefore $e(G)\leq\binom{2l+2}{2}+l+1+\lfloor\frac{n-3l-3}{2}\rfloor<\binom{2l+3}{2}+\lfloor\frac{n-2l-3}{2}\rfloor$, which is also a contradiction. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.8. **Proof.**[Proof of Theorem 1.8] For $l=2$, the assertion follows from Lemma 4.1. Hence we may assume $l\geq 3$. Let G be any graph which does not contain $P_{2l+1}\bigcup P_3$ and

$$e(G)\geq\max\left\{\binom{2l+3}{2}+\lfloor\frac{n-2l-3}{2}\rfloor,\binom{l}{2}+l(n-l)+1,[n,2l+1,2l+1]\right\}.$$

Then by Theorem 1.3, G contains P_{2l+1}.

Case 1. G does not contain P_{2l+3}, we claim that G is connected. In fact, if G is disconnected, then one of the components, says C with n_1 vertices, must contain P_{2l+1} and the other component is edge or isolated vertex. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
e(G) &= e(C)+e(G-C)\\
&\leq ex_{con}(n_1,P_{2l+3})+\lfloor\frac{n-n_1}{2}\rfloor\\
&\leq \max\left\{\binom{2l+1}{2}+n_1-2l-1,\binom{l}{2}+l(n_1-l)+1\right\}+\lfloor\frac{n-n_1}{2}\rfloor\\
&< \max\left\{\binom{2l+3}{2}+\lfloor\frac{n-2l-3}{2}\rfloor,\binom{l}{2}+l(n-l)+1,[n,2l+1,2l+1]\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which also is a contradiction. Further by Theorem 1.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
e(G) &\leq \max\left\{\binom{2l+1}{2}+n-2l-1,\binom{l}{2}+l(n-l)+1\right\}\\
&\leq \max\left\{\binom{2l+3}{2}+\lfloor\frac{n-2l-3}{2}\rfloor,\binom{l}{2}+l(n-l)+1,[n,2l+1,2l+1]\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

with the quality holds when $G=K_l+(K_2\bigcup\overline{K}_{n-l-2})$, where the last inequality follows from $\binom{l}{2}+l(n-l)+1\geq\binom{2l+1}{2}+n-2l-1$ for $n\geq\frac{5l-1}{2}$, and $\binom{2l+1}{2}+n-2l-1<\binom{2l+3}{2}+\lfloor\frac{n-2l-3}{2}\rfloor$ for $n<\frac{5l-1}{2}$. So the assertion holds.

Case 2. G contains P_{2l+3}. Let $P_{2l+3}=x_1x_2\ldots x_{2l+3}$, $Y=G-P_{2l+3}$ and $V(Y)=\{y_1,y_2,\ldots,y_{n-2l-3}\}$, $d_{P_{2l+3}}(y_i)$ be the number of vertices which adjacent to y_i in P_{2l+3} for $i=1,2,\ldots,n-2l-3$. Obviously, y_i can not hit $x_1,x_2,x_{2l+2},x_{2l+3}$, moreover y_i can not hit both vertices of $\{x_k,x_{k+1}\}$ or $\{x_k,x_{k+4}\}$ for $k=1,2,\ldots,2l+3$. So $d_{P_{2l+3}}(y_i)\leq l-1$. Let y be a vertex in Y with $d_{P_{2l+3}}(y)$ being maximum value, and $x_{i_1},x_{i_2},\ldots,x_{i_s}$ be the all neighbours of y in P_{2l+3}, if $s=0$, then $G[P_{2l+3}]$ is a component of G, the result follows. Hence we may assume $s\geq 1$.

Claim. There are $2s$ distinct vertices in P_{2l+3} which form s pairs vertices whose degree sum is at most $2l+3$.

Fact 1. $i_{k+1}-i_k\neq 4$. Because G does not contain $P_{2l+3}\bigcup P_3$.

Fact 2. $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k-1})+d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k+2})\leq 2l+3$. Let x_p be a neighbor of x_{i_k-1}. If $p<i_k-1$, then x_{i_k+2} can not hit x_{p+1}, otherwise, $x_1x_2\ldots x_px_{i_k-1}\ldots x_{p+1}x_{i_k+2}\ldots x_{2l+3}$ together with $yx_{i_k}x_{i_k+1}$ is a

$P_{2l+1} \bigcup P_3$ in G, a contradiction. Similarly, if $p > i_k+1$, x_{i_k+2} can not hit x_{p+1}. Let $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k-1}) = z$. Since x_{i_k+2} can not hit x_1, we have $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k-1}) + d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k+2}) \leq z+2+2l+2-z-1 = 2l+3$.

Fact 3. $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k-2}) + d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{i_k+1}) \leq 2l+3$. The proof of this fact is similar to the proof of Fact 2.

Let $x_{i_{j_l}}$ be the neighbor of y such that $x_{i_{j_l}-2}$ is also the neighbor of y for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, t$. Obviously, $\{x_{i_{j_1}}, x_{i_{j_2}}, \ldots, x_{i_{j_t}}\}$ divides P_{2l+3} into $t+1$ parts. By Fact 1, we can choose pairs of vertices in each part by $\{x_{i_k-1}, x_{i_k+2}\}, \{x_{i_{k+1}-2}, x_{i_{k+1}+1}\}$ alternately. In the first part, we choose $\{x_{i_1-1}, x_{i_1+2}\}$, $\{x_{i_2-2}, x_{i_2+1}\}$, $\{x_{i_3-1}, x_{i_3+2}\}$, $\ldots$, $\{x_{i_{j_1}-4}, x_{i_{j_1}-1}\}$ or $\{x_{i_{j_1}-3}, x_{i_{j_1}}\}$. In the following parts, we will always begin with the pair $\{x_{i_{j_l}-2}, x_{i_{j_l}+1}\}$, for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, t$. So in the second part, we choose $\{x_{i_{j_1}-2}, x_{i_{j_1}+1}\}$, $\{x_{i_{j_1+1}-1}, x_{i_{j_1+1}+2}\}$, $\{x_{i_{j_1+2}-2}, x_{i_{j_1+2}+1}\}$, $\ldots$, $\{x_{i_{j_2}-4}, x_{i_{j_2}-1}\}$ or $\{x_{i_{j_2}-3}, x_{i_{j_2}}\}$. The process will go on until in the last part we choose $\{x_{i_{j_t}-2}, x_{i_{j_t}+1}\}, \{x_{i_{j_t+1}-1}, x_{i_{j_t+1}+2}\}, \{x_{i_{j_t+2}-2}, x_{i_{j_t+2}+1}\}, \ldots,$ $\{x_{i_s-2}, x_{i_s+1}\}$ or $\{x_{i_s-1}, x_{i_s+2}\}$. By Facts 2 and 3, those s pairs vertices whose degree sum is at most $2l+3$. Thus we finish our claim.

Those s pairs of vertices together with $\{x_1, x_{2l+2}\}$ or $\{x_1, x_{2l+3}\}$ are distinct vertices, and $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_1) + d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{2l+2}) \leq 2l+1$, $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_1) + d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{2l+3}) \leq 2l+1$. In fact, if $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_1) + d_{P_{k+2}}(x_{2l+2}) \geq 2l+2$ or $d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_1) + d_{P_{2l+3}}(x_{2l+3}) \geq 2l+2$, G must contain C_{2l+2} or C_{2l+3}, by Lemma 4.2, G contains $P_{2l+3} \bigcup P_3$, a contradiction. Hence, we have

$$e(G) \leq \binom{2l+3}{2} - \lceil \frac{2s(l+1)+2l+3}{2} \rceil + s(n-2l-3) + \lfloor \frac{n-2l-3}{2} \rfloor.$$

We will consider two cases. (1) If $n \leq 3l+5$, then $e(G) < \binom{2l+3}{2} + \lfloor \frac{n-2l-3}{2} \rfloor$. (2) If $n \geq 3l+6$, we will show that $e(G) < \binom{l}{2} + l(n-l) + 1$. Since

$$\binom{l}{2} + l(n-l) + 1 - \left[\binom{2l+3}{2} - \lceil \frac{2s(l+1)+2l+3}{2} \rceil + s(n-2l-3) + \lfloor \frac{n-2l-3}{2} \rfloor \right]$$

is increasing with respect to n, we only to check $n = 3l+6$, that is $\binom{2l+3}{2} - [s(l+1)+l+2] + s(l+3) + \lfloor \frac{l+3}{2} \rfloor < \binom{l}{2} + (2l+6)l + 1$, this is true for $l \geq 3$. By (1) and (2),

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &< \max\left\{ \binom{2l+1}{2} + n - 2l - 1, \binom{l}{2} + l(n-l) + 1 \right\} \\ &< \max\left\{ \binom{2l+3}{2} + \lfloor \frac{n-2l-3}{2} \rfloor, \binom{l}{2} + l(n-l) + 1, [n, 2l+1, 2l+1] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. The proof is completed. ■

5 Proof of Theorem 1.9

In order to prove Theorem 1.9, we need the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *Let G be a connected graph with n vertices. If $n \geq 10$, then*

$$ex_{con}(n, P_5 \bigcup P_5) \leq \max\{[n, 10, 5], 3n-5\}.$$

Moreover if $ex_{con}(n, P_5 \bigcup P_5) = 3n-5$, then $G = (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-5}) + K_3$.

Proof. Let $G \neq (K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-5}) + K_3$ be any connected graph which does not contain $P_5 \bigcup P_5$ with $e(G) \geq \max\{[n, 10, 5], 3n-5\}$. Then $\max\{[n, 10, 5], 3n-5\} \geq ex_{con}(n, P_9)$. By Theorem 1.4, G contains P_9. Let $P_9 = x_1x_2 \ldots x_9$ be a subgraph of G. Then each vertex in $G - P_9$ misses $\{x_1, x_4, x_6, x_9\}$ and can not hit both vertices of $\{x_2, x_8\}$. Moreover, if y is not an isolated vertex in $G - P_9$, then y can only hit x_5, otherwise G contains $P_5 \bigcup P_5$. First, we will prove the following Facts.

Fact 1. If an edge of $G - P_9$ hits P_9, then $e(G[P_9]) \leq 24$.

Let y_1y_2 be an edge in $G - P_9$, y_1 hits x_5. Then $\{x_1, x_2\}$ misses $\{x_6, x_7, x_8, x_9\}$ and $\{x_3, x_4\}$ misses $\{x_8, x_9\}$. So $e(G[P_9]) \leq 36 - 12 = 24$.

Fact 2. If a $P_3 = y_1y_2y_3$ of $G - P_9$ such that y_1 hits P_9, then $e(G[P_9]) \leq 21$.

Clearly, y_1 must hit x_5, $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ misses $\{x_6, x_7, x_8, x_9\}$ and x_4 misses $\{x_7, x_8, x_9\}$. So $e(G[P_9]) \leq 36 - 15 = 21$.

Fact 3. If two isolated vertices both hit three vertices of P_9, then they must hit the same vertices. Moreover $e(G[P_9]) \leq 21$.

Let y_1, y_2 be two vertices both hit three vertices of P_9. If y_1 hits x_2, x_5, x_7, then y_2 can not hit x_3, otherwise y_2 hits x_3 which implies that $x_4x_3y_2x_5x_6$, $x_1x_2y_1x_7x_8$ are two disjoint P_5. Moreover, y_2 can't hit x_8, otherwise $x_1x_2y_2x_8x_9$, $x_3x_4x_5x_6x_7$ are two disjoint P_5. Hence y_2 hits x_2, x_5, x_7. Further it is easy to see that there is no edge among $x_1, \{x_3, x_4\}, x_6, \{x_8, x_9\}$ and $\{x_3, x_4\}$ misses x_7. Then $e(G[P_9]) \leq 36 - 15 = 21$. If y_1 hits x_3, x_5, x_7, then y_2 can not hit x_2, x_8, otherwise y_2 hits x_2 which implies that $x_1x_2y_2x_7x_8$ ($x_1x_2y_2x_7x_8$) and $x_4x_3y_1x_5x_6$ are two disjoint P_5. Hence y_2 hits x_3, x_5, x_7. It is easy to see that there is no edge among $\{x_1, x_2\}, x_4, x_6, \{x_8, x_9\}$ and $\{x_1, x_2\}$ misses x_7. Then $e(G[P_9]) \leq 36 - 15 = 21$.

Fact 4. If an isolated vertex hit two vertices of P_9, then $e(G[P_9]) \leq 29$.

Let y be an isolated vertex in $G - P_9$ which hits exact two vertices of P_9. If y hits $\{x_2, x_5\}$, then $\{x_3, x_4\}$ misses $\{x_7, x_9\}$ and x_1 misses $\{x_4, x_6, x_9\}$. If y hits $\{x_3, x_5\}$, then $\{x_1, x_2\}$ misses $\{x_7, x_9\}$, x_1 misses $\{x_4, x_6\}$, and x_9 misses x_4. If y hits $\{x_2, x_7\}$, then $\{x_3, x_5\}$ misses $\{x_8, x_9\}$, and x_1 misses $\{x_3, x_4, x_6\}$. If y hits $\{x_3, x_7\}$, then $\{x_4, x_6\}$ misses $\{x_1, x_2, x_8, x_9\}$. In any situation, it is easy to see that $e(G[P_9]) \leq 36 - 7 = 29$.

Fact 5. If an isolated vertex hits one vertex of P_9, then $e(G[P_9]) \leq 33$.

Let y be an isolated vertex in $G - P_9$ which hits only one vertex of P_9. If y hits x_2, then x_1 misses $\{x_4, x_6, x_9\}$. If y hits x_3, then $\{x_1, x_2\}$ misses $\{x_7, x_9\}$. If y hits x_5, then x_1 misses $\{x_6, x_9\}$ and x_9 misses $\{x_1, x_4\}$. In any situation, it is easy to see that $e(G[P_9]) \leq 36 - 3 = 33$.

Now we consider the following two cases.

Case 1. There is an edge in $G - P_9$. Let P_k be a longest path start at x_5 in $G[x_5 \bigcup V(G - P_9)]$. If $k \geq 4$, then the number of edges incident with the vertices of $G - P_9$ is at most $3(n-9)$. Since $G - P_9$ can't contain P_5, y can only hit x_5 for y being not an isolated vertex in $G - P_9$ and an isolated vertex in $G - P_9$ hits at most three vertices of P_9. By Fact 2, we have $e(G) \leq 21 + 3(n-9) < \max\{[n, 10, 5], 3n-5\}$, a contradiction. If $k \leq 3$, each component of $G - P_9$ is a star (with at least three vertices), or an edge, or an isolated vertex. Clearly, only the center of the star (the vertex of the star with degree more than one) can hit x_5. Hence the number of edges incident with the vertices of $G - P_9$ is at most $3(n-9) - 3$. So by Fact 1, $e(G) \leq 24 + 3(n-9) - 3 < \max\{[n, 10, 5], 3n-5\}$, which is also a contradiction.

Case 2: There are no edges in $G-P_9$. If there are at least two vertices which hits three vertices of P_9, then by Fact 3, we have $e(G) \leq 21+3(n-9) < \max\{[n,10,5],3n-5\}$, a contradiction. If all vertices of $G-P_9$ hit only one vertex of P_9, then by Fact 5, we have $e(G) \leq 33+(n-9) < \max\{[n,10,5],3n-5\}$, a contradiction. If there is at least one vertex which hits two vertices of P_9 and there is at most one vertex which hits three vertices of P_9, then by Fact 4, we have $e(G) \leq 29+2(n-9)+1 < \max\{[n,10,5],3n-5\}$, a contradiction. So the assertion holds. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.9. **Proof.**[Proof of Theorem 1.9] Let G be any graph which does not contain $P_5 \bigcup P_5$ with $e(G) \geq max\{[n,10,5],3n-5\}$. If G is connected, then the assertion follows from Lemma 5.1. If G is disconnected, G contains P_5 by $e(G) > ex(n,P_5)$. Let C be a component with $n_1 \geq 5$ vertices which contains P_5. Obviously C contains no $P_5 \bigcup P_5$ and $G-C$ contains no P_5. If $n_1 \geq 10$, then

$$e(G) \leq \max\{[n_1,10,5],3n_1-5\} + [n-n_1,5,5] < \max\{[n,10,5],3n-5\}.$$

If $n_1 \leq 9$, then $e(G) \leq \binom{n_1}{2} + [n-n_1,5,5] \leq \max\{[n,10,5],3n-5\}$ with the equality holds only when $n_1 = 9$ and $G = K_9 \bigcup Ex(n,P_5)$. The proof is completed. ■

6 Conclusion

Theorems 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9 show that

$$ex(n,F_m) = \max\left\{[n,k_1,k_1],[n,k_1+k_2,k_2],\ldots,[n,\sum_{i=1}^{m}k_i,k_m]\right\} \text{ for small } n,$$

while Theorem 1.6 determines the value $ex(n,F_m)$ for n sufficiently large. So we may propose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 6.1 *Let $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_m \geq 3$ and $k_1 > 3$. If $F_m = P_{k_1} \bigcup P_{k_2} \bigcup \ldots \bigcup P_{k_m}$, then*

$$e(n,F_m) \quad = \quad \max\left\{[n,k_1,k_1],[n,k_1+k_2,k_2],\ldots,\left[n,\sum_{i=1}^{m}k_i,k_m\right],\left[n,\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lfloor\frac{k_i}{2}\rfloor\right]+c\right\},$$

where $c=1$ if all of $k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_m$ are odd, and $c=0$ for otherwise. Moreover, the extremal graphs are

$$Ex(n,P_{k_1}),\ldots,K_{\sum_{i=1}^{m}k_i-1} \bigcup Ex(n-\sum_{i=1}^{m}k_i+1,P_{k_m}), \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} K_{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lfloor\frac{k_i}{2}\rfloor-1}+(K_2 \bigcup \overline{K}_{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lfloor\frac{k_i}{2}\rfloor-1}) & \text{if all of } \{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_m\} \text{ are odd,} \\ K_{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lfloor\frac{k_i}{2}\rfloor-1}+(\overline{K}_{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lfloor\frac{k_i}{2}\rfloor+1}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{array}$$

References

[1] P.N. Balister, E. Győri, J. Lehel, and R.H. Schelp, Connected graphs without long paths. *Discrete Mathematics* **308** (2008) 4487-4494.

[2] B. Bollobás, Extremal graph theory, (1979) Academic Press.

[3] N. Bushaw, and N. Kettle, Turán numbers of multiple paths and equibipartite forests. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **20** (2011) 837-853.

[4] N. Bushaw, and N. Kettle, Turán numbers for forests of paths in hypergraphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **28(2)** pp. (2014) 711-721.

[5] P. Erdős, and T. Gallai, On maximal paths and circuits of graphs. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica* **10(3)** (1959) 337-356.

[6] P. Erdős, über ein Extremalproblem in der Graphentheorie (German). *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **13** (1962) 122-127.

[7] P. Erdős, A problem on independent r-tuple. *Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest* **8** (1965) 93-95.

[8] P. Erdős, Problems and results in graph theory and combinatorial analysis, in: Proceedings of the Fifth British Combinatorial Conference, 1975, vol. **15**, (1976) pp. 169-192.

[9] R.J. Faudree, and R.H. Schelp, Path Ramsey numbers in multicolourings. *J. Combin. Theory B* **19** (1975) 150-160.

[10] P. Frankl, On the maximum number of edges in a hypergraph with given matching number. (2012) arXiv e-prints.

[11] P. Frankl, Improved bounds for Erdős matching conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **120** (2013) no. 5, 1068-1072.

[12] Z. Füredi, and M. Simonovits, The history of degenerate (bipartite) extremal graph problems. *Erdős centennial, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.* **25** János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest., (2013) 169-264.

[13] I. Gorgol, Turan numbers for disjoint copies of graphs. *Graphs Combin.* **27** (2011) 661-667.

[14] R. Gu, X. Li, and Y. Shi, Turán numbers of vertex disjoint cycles. (2013) arXiv:1305.5372.

[15] H. Huang, P. Loh, and B. Sudakov, The size of a hypergraph and its matchingnumber. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **21** (2012) 442C450.

[16] P. Keevash, Hypergraph Turán problems. In *Surveys in Combinatircs 2011,* London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **392**, Cambridge University Press, Cambrigde, pp. (2011) 83-139.

[17] G.N. Kopylov, On maximal paths and cycles in a graph. *Soviet Math. Dokl,* **18** (1977) 593-596.

[18] B. Lidický, H. Liu, and C. Palmer, On the turán number of forests. *The electronic journal of combinatorics* **20(2)** Paper 62,(2013) 13 pp.

[19] J.W. Moon, On independent complete subgraphs in a graph. *Canad. J. Math.* **20** (1968) 95-102.

[20] D. Mubayi, and J. Verstraëte, A survey of Turán problems for expansions. (2015) arXiv e-prints.

[21] M. Simonovits,A method for solving extremal problems in extremal graph theory. In *Theory of Graphs* P. Erdős and G. Katona eds, Academic Press, (1968) 279-319.

[22] P. Turán, On an extremal problem in graph theory (in Hungrarian). *Mat. es Fiz. Lapok.* **48** (1941) 436-452.

[23] L. Yuan and X. Zhang, The Turán number of disjoint copies of paths. *Discrete Mathematics* **340(2)** (2017) 132-139.

A Proof of observations

Observation 1: Let $n \geq k_1 + k_m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\left\{\binom{k_1+k_m-2}{2} + n - k_1 - k_m + 2, [n, k_1+k_m]\right\} \\ \leq\ & \max\left\{[n, k_1+k_m, k_m], [n, k_1+k_m]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. $k_1 + k_m$ is odd. If $n > \frac{5(k_1+k_m)-7}{4} + \frac{2}{k_1+k_m-5}$, then

$$\binom{k_1+k_m-2}{2} + n - k_1 - k_m + 2 < [n, k_1+k_m].$$

If $n \leq \frac{5(k_1+k_m)-7}{4} + \frac{2}{k_1+k_m-5}$, then

$$\binom{k_1+k_m-2}{2} + n - k_1 - k_m + 2 < \binom{k_1+k_m-1}{2} \leq [n, k_1+k_m, k_m].$$

Case 2. $k_1 + k_m$ is even. If $n > \frac{5(k_1+k_m)-10}{4}$, then

$$\binom{k_1+k_m-2}{2} + n - k_1 - k_m + 2 < [n, k_1+k_m].$$

If $n \leq \frac{5(k_1+k_m)-10}{4}$, then

$$\binom{k_1+k_m-2}{2} + n - k_1 - k_m + 2 < \binom{k_1+k_m-1}{2} \leq [n, k_1+k_m, k_m].$$

Hence the assertion holds.

Observation 2: Let $n_1 \geq k_1$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_m, k_m] \leq [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_m, k_m].$$

Proof. Let $n_1 = k_1 + t_1(k_m-1) + r_1, n_2 = t_2(k_m-1) + r_2$ and $n_1 + n_2 = k_1 + t_3(k_m-1) + r_3$, where $0 \leq r_1, r_2, r_3 < k_m - 1$. If $t_1 \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & [n_1, k_1+k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_m, k_m] \\ =\ & \binom{k_1+k_m-1}{2} + (t_1-1)\binom{k_m-1}{2} + \binom{r_1}{2} + t_2\binom{k_m-1}{2} + \binom{r_2}{2} \\ \leq\ & \binom{k_1+k_m-1}{2} + (t_3-1)\binom{k_m-1}{2} + \binom{r_3}{2} \\ =\ & [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_m, k_m], \end{aligned}$$

with equality only when $r_1 = 0$ or $r_2 = 0$. If $t_1 = 0$, it is easy to see that the observation holds, moreover the equality can not occur.

Observation 3: Let $n_1 \geq k_1$ and $n_2 \geq k_2$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1+k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2+k_m, k_m] < [n_1+n_2, k_1+k_2+k_m, k_m].$$

Proof. Let $n_1 = k_1 + t_1(k_m - 1) + r_1, n_2 = k_2 + t_2(k_m - 1) + r_2, n_1 + n_2 = k_1 + k_2 + t_3(k_m - 1) + r_3$, where $0 \leq r_1, r_2, r_3 < k_m - 1$. If $k_1 \geq 1$ and $k_2 \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& [n_1, k_1 + k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m, k_m] \\
= \; & \binom{k_1 + k_m - 1}{2} + (t_1 - 1)\binom{k_m - 1}{2} + \binom{r_1}{2} \\
& + \binom{k_2 + k_m - 1}{2} + (t_2 - 1)\binom{k_m - 1}{2} + \binom{r_2}{2} \\
< \; & \binom{k_1 + k_2 + k_m - 1}{2} + \binom{k_m - 1}{2} + (t_1 + t_2 - 2)\binom{k_m - 1}{2} + \binom{r_1}{2} + \binom{r_2}{2} \\
\leq \; & \binom{k_1 + k_2 + k_m - 1}{2} + (t_3 - 1)\binom{k_m - 1}{2} + \binom{r_3}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $k_1 = 0$ or $k_2 = 0$, similarly we can prove that $[n_1, k_1 + k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m, k_m] < [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m, k_m]$.

Observation 4: Let $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_m$ and $n_2 \geq k_2 + k_m$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1 + k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m] < [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m].$$

Proof. This observation follows from the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
[n_1, k_1 + k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m] &\leq [n_1 + n_2 - \lfloor \frac{k_2 + k_m - 2}{2} \rfloor, k_1 + k_m] + e(K_{\lfloor \frac{k_2 + k_m - 2}{2} \rfloor}) \\
&< [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m].
\end{aligned}$$

Observation 5: Let $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_m$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1 + k_m] + [n_2, k_m, k_m] < [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_m].$$

Proof. Let $n_2 = t_2(k_m - 1) + r_2$,

$$G_1 = K_{\lfloor \frac{k_1 + k_m - 2}{2} \rfloor} + \overline{K}_{n - \lfloor \frac{k_1 + k_m - 2}{2} \rfloor} \text{ and } G_2 = t_2 \cdot K_{k_m - 1} + K_{r_2}.$$

Since $e(G_2) < n_2(\lfloor \frac{k_1 + k_m}{2} \rfloor - 1)$, this observation follows easily.

Observation 6: Let $n_1 \geq k_1$ and $n_2 \geq k_2 + k_m$. Then

$$[n_1, k_1 + k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m, k_m] < [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m].$$

Proof. The proof of this observation is similar to the proof of observation 5.

Observation 7: Let $n_1 \geq k_1 + k_m, n_2 \geq k_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& [n_1, k_1 + k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m] \\
< \; & \max\{[n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m, k_m], [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m]\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. If $n_2 \geq \lfloor \frac{k_1}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k_2}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k_m}{2} \rfloor - 1$, then $[n_1, k_1 + k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m] < [n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m] + [n_1, k_1 + k_m, k_m] \leq [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m]$.

Case 2. If $n_2 \leq \lfloor \frac{k_1}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k_2}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k_m}{2} \rfloor - 1$, then $[n_1, k_1 + k_m, k_m] + [n_2, k_2 + k_m] < [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + \lfloor \frac{k_2}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k_m}{2} \rfloor + k_m, k_m] \leq [n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2 + k_m, k_m]$.